

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/650,362 | GANESH ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Dieu-Minh Le | Art Unit 2114 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dieu-Minh Le. (3) _____.

(2) Marcel K. Bingham [Reg. No. 42,327]. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2/20/07 & 2/23/07.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-30.

Identification of prior art discussed: 5,278,982; 5,287,501; 5,452,430.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Main issues discussed were:

- a. Double Patenting rejection over patents 5,850,507; 6,182,241; and 6,647,510; Applicant's Attorney agreed file Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the rejection.
- b. Improper format for claims 16-30; Applicant's Attorney agreed to rewrite claims 16-30.
- c. Discussed the above prior arts over the claimed invention; Applicant's Attorney agreed to amend the claims according to Examiner's Amendment.